



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/527,594

12/13/2005

Amy Newman

1173-1027PUS1

7609

33883 7590 11/25/2008
Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

JARRELL, NOBLE E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/527,594	Applicant(s) NEWMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner NOBLE JARRELL	Art Unit 1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6,12-16,20,21,23 and 30-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-16 and 33-35 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6,12,20,21 and 23 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13 and 30-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1624

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) has been overcome by the amendment filed 8/18/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Newly amended claim 13 and newly added claims 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicants are not enabled for inhibition of the D₃ receptor with any compound encompassed by the catch-all group, group VI.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir., 1988). The court in *Wands* states, "Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation, such as routine screening. However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue', not 'experimentation'" (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to make or use the invention. "Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations" (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Among these factors are: (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the breadth of the claims; (3) the state of the prior art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the relative skill of those in the art; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

Consideration of the relevant factors sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case for lack of enablement is set forth herein below:

(1) *The nature of the invention and (2) the breadth of the claims:*

Art Unit: 1624

The claims are drawn to treatment of cocaine abuse through inhibition of dopamine D₃ receptors with compound that have a phenyl-piperazine group indirectly connected to an alkene, alkyne, or cyclohexyl group. Thus, the claims taken together with the specification imply that cocaine abuse can be treated with a compound prepared by applicants.

(3) The state of the prior art and (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art:

Newman et al. (*Bioorganic and Medicinal Chemistry Letters*, **2003**, 13, 2179-83) teach there are inconsistencies between *in vitro* and *in vivo* models of D₃ receptor function, and further investigation of novel D₃ compound is required (page 2182). In addition, Newman et al. teach compound 23 (page 2180) inhibits D₃ receptors *in vitro* with a K_i of 2.4 plus or minus 1.4 nM. However, this compound does not enable applicants to inhibit the D₃ receptor because it is not "structurally rigid" in the context of this application. In compound 23, an alkane (saturated) chain is connecting the carboxamide and piperazine portions of the molecule. In the context of this application, "structurally rigid" implies that an alkene or alkyne functional group is part of the linking group between the carboxamide and piperazine portions of the molecule. Applicants provide no evidence that these compounds actually work the way in which they are intended to do so.

(5) The relative skill of those in the art:

One of ordinary skill in the art can perform an assay to determine *in vitro* D₃ receptor inhibition.

(6) The amount of direction or guidance presented and (7) the presence or absence of working examples:

Art Unit: 1624

The specification does not provide guidance that any compounds of the elected catch-all group can actually perform the function that is intended.

(8) The quantity of experimentation necessary:

Considering the state of the art as discussed by the references above, particularly with regards to newly amended claim 13 and newly added claims 30-32 and the high unpredictability in the art as evidenced therein, and the lack of guidance provided in the specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would be burdened with undue experimentation to practice the invention commensurate in the scope of the claims.

This rejection is maintained because this reference does not teach that any structures where variable R_1 is indole can act as D_3 receptor inhibitors. The reference teaches compounds where variable R_1 is fluorene or phenyl. Neither of these rings can be considered equivalent to an indole ring because these rings are carbocycles, not heterocycles.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1624

5. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 12, 20, and 23 appear free of the prior art of record.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Liebeschuetz et al. (WO2001096323, published December 20, 2001, IPC classification teach the closest prior art, which is example 73 (page 158). In this compound, variable R_1 is indole, C_m is CH(cyclohexyl)(C(O)piperazin-4-(1-methyl-piperidienyl)). This group does not read on instant claim 1, and thus claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 12, 20, and 23 appear free of the prior art of record.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NOBLE JARRELL whose telephone number is (571)272-9077. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 A.M - 6:00 P.M. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. James O. Wilson can be reached on (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Noble Jarrell/
Examiner, Art Unit 1624

**/James O. Wilson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1624**